

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

HANEEF MUHAMMAD,

Plaintiff,

v.

**Civil Action 2:24-cv-4247
Judge Michael H. Watson
Magistrate Judge Chelsey M. Vascura**

THE KROGER CO., *et al.*,

Defendants.

ORDER

Plaintiff, Haneef Muhammad, currently has one other active case in this Court (*see* Case No. 2:24-cv-3676-DRC-CMV, Muhammad v. GAP Inc., et al.) (the “GAP” case). On June 24, 2025, the undersigned issued an order revoking Plaintiff’s electronic case filing access in the GAP case, owing to Plaintiff’s excessive filings in that case in contravention of a Court order. (GAP case, ECF No. 107). It was the undersigned’s intention to revoke Plaintiff’s electronic case filing access in the GAP case only. However, it has come to the Court’s attention that it is impossible from a technological standpoint to revoke a litigant’s electronic case filing access in only one case. The Court’s e-filing system is structured such that a litigant may file electronically in all of his cases or none of them.

As in the GAP case, Plaintiff was cautioned in this case that his electronic case filing access may be revoked at any time. (ECF No. 14.) Additionally, although not to the level of his excessive filing in the GAP case, Plaintiff has also made duplicative filings in this case recently. (*See* ECF Nos. 20, 21, 23, all versions of an amended complaint filed between May 9 and May

24, 2025, all of which were stricken by the Court as duplicative.) Accordingly, the undersigned finds that it would not be unjust to revoke Plaintiff's electronic case filing access in this case as well. The alternative would be to permit Plaintiff to electronically file unchecked in both cases, subject only to striking the offending filings after the fact. That result would lead only to more needless consumption of judicial resources, which the GAP revocation order was intended to avoid.

For these reasons, Plaintiff's electronic case filing access in this case is **REVOKED**. Plaintiff must make any future filings in this case by delivering the documents in question to the office of the Clerk of Court, either in person or via U.S. mail.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Chelsey M. Vascura
CHELSEY M. VASCURA
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE